IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	
Plaintiff,) 8:09CR!)	54
vs.)) ORDEF	₹
JAMES WEEKLY,)	
Defendant.)	

This matter is before the court on the motion for an extension of time by defendant James Weekly (Weekly) (Filing No. 11). Weekly seeks until May 7, 2009, in which to file pretrial motions in accordance with the progression order (Filing No. 10). Weekly has filed an affidavit wherein he consents to the motion and acknowledges he understands the additional time may be excludable time for the purposes of the Speedy Trial Act (Filing No. 12). Weekly's counsel represents that government's counsel has no objection to the motion. Upon consideration, the motion will be granted.

IT IS ORDERED:

Defendant Weekly's motion for an extension of time (Filing No. 11) is granted. Weekly is given until **on or before May 7, 2009,** in which to file pretrial motions pursuant to the progression order. The ends of justice have been served by granting such motion and outweigh the interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. The additional **time** arising as a result of the granting of the motion, i.e., the time between **April 8, 2009 and May 7, 2009**, shall be deemed **excludable** time in any computation of time under the requirement of the Speedy Trial Act for the reason defendant's counsel requires additional time to adequately prepare the case, taking into consideration due diligence of counsel, and the novelty and complexity of this case. The failure to grant additional time might result in a miscarriage of justice. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A) & (B).

DATED this 8th day of April, 2009.

BY THE COURT:

s/Thomas D. Thalken United States Magistrate Judge